



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)	MAIL STOP RCE
Bas Ordning et al.)	Group Art Unit: 2179
Application No.: 10/689,687)	Examiner: Nicholas Augustine
Filed: October 22, 2003)	Confirmation No.: 4912
For: COMPUTER INTERFACE HAVING)	
A VIRTUAL SINGLE-LAYER MODE)	
FOR VIEWING)	

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Subsequent to issuing the final Office Action dated June 7, 2007, Examiner Osberg left the employment of the Patent and Trademark Office, and the responsibility for examination of the subject application was transferred to Examiner Augustine. It is believed that an interview with the Examiner would advance the prosecution of the application, since it is not apparent from the final Office Action how the specific language of the claims is being interpreted relative to the disclosures of the references. Since Examiner Augustine is not familiar with the application, this Response is being filed in conjunction with a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.114, to provide an opportunity for an interview to be conducted between Examiner Augustine and Applicants' representative prior to a further Action on the merits.

The purpose of the interview is to review the current grounds of rejection set forth in the final Office Action, particularly with respect to the interpretation of the references expressed by Examiner Osberg. This Response will be supplemented,

as appropriate, subsequent to the interview and prior to the first Office Action on the merits.

The primary issues to be discussed during the interview include:


1. The manner in which the Southgate patent is being interpreted to anticipate the claimed feature of repositioning all open windows in a group in response to a command to present the alternative view (see Applicants' previous response at pages 19-20);
2. The manner in which the Southgate patent is being interpreted to anticipate the claimed feature of "*maintaining the relative sizes and configurations of the windows*" while they are being repositioned (see Applicants' previous response at pages 20-22);
3. The manner in which the Southgate patent is being interpreted to anticipate a second mode in which plural objects are *concurrently moved* from their positions to respective areas within a display, as recited in claim 35 (see Applicants' previous response at page 22); and
4. The disclosure of the Bronson patent relative to the subject matter recited in claims 57-60 (see Applicants' previous response at pages 23-25).

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 7, 2007

By: _____


James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620